

Date: Mon, 13 Jun 94 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #255  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Mon, 13 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    255

Today's Topics:

                    440 in So. Cal. (5 msgs)  
                                CW Argument...  
                    Usefulness of the amateur service

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 12 Jun 1994 19:49:12 -0700  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:  
: cmoore@ilx018.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT-~) writes:

: > If that really is the only way that hams can think of to solve the problem,  
: > it is probably time for a more technically oriented repeater coordinating  
: > body to be established which is not made up of hams. Good thing hams are  
: > not the coordinating body for cellular telephones.

: Unfortunately, hams don't have access to the same level of technology  
: in commercially-available radios. I've already proposed a digital  
: stdm shared access to the frequency with appropriate "keys" limiting  
: which frames a repeater would and would not decypher. This equipment  
: is a long time in the coming.

: -- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

I really have to laugh as here in the Bay Area the hams ARE the coordinators of cellular telephones. Many of the radio engineers who design the cellular network are amateurs. They are also the trustees of local repeaters. At work they design systems that only cover a couple of square miles and are limited by capture. At play in the amateur community their systems may cover hundreds to thousands of square miles. A totally different scale. At work they have technology to help them sort out the limited spectrum. Smart radios that can automatically frequency hop and change to six different power levels all under three watts.

How many amateurs have this kind of technology in the amateur service? One of the new portable radios has a power scaling function built in. If the radio hears the repeater full scale it automatically lowers power. This is a good thing to save battery and it also helps the co-channel repeater. How? lower signal levels on the repeater input frequency. How many of you have turned off this function .... because you are too noisy into the repeater. We are starting to see more and more technology help us provide a higher grade of repeater service than the commercial service providers.

How long does it take the amateur community to find that ctcss does not close a repeater... it enhances the repeater.

There are eight repeaters on our frequency all at the same mountain top. The users love it. One repeater with eight ctcss tones encode and decode. All the new hams are using tone 100 and the old grouches use tone 114.8 . Neither group has to listen to each other as they can decode their own group. We ask that when groups are talking that they not decode but listen in the clear. When monitoring they can decode for their group. Some tone groups are not very active, they are used as intercoms for RACES and ARES groups. Each one of these groups could have its own repeater but through modern technology they can all enjoy the use of one good repeater. No lock-outs no bs political constraints, just a lot of different small groups enjoying amateur radio.

"Join 'The Club'... Endorsed by repeater owners everywhere..."

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

-----

Date: 13 Jun 1994 04:10:18 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bob Wilkins n6fri (rwilkins@ccnet.com) wrote:

: The un-coordinated station is unable to detect rf on the output frequency  
: do (due?) to its own transmitter in operation.

Don't you know they can be linked over a control channel?

: Here in California you will find many closed 440 repeater groups have two  
: or three different repeaters operating in the same general area on the  
: same frequency.

Some on this thread said that it couldn't be done but it looks as if the problem has already been solved. Why not extend the solution to other repeaters?

: In essence most closed repeater groups have more restrictions placed on  
: their members than one would find on a normal open repeater. Bob

We have all agreed that all repeaters are closed by definition. Why not cooperate and solve the problems with technology?

73, KG7BK, 00TC, CecilMoore@delphi.com

-----

Date: 13 Jun 1994 04:28:07 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:

: The problem is that \*I\* don't agree to it, since the problem can  
: work in both directions. Maybe its my repeater one time, and then his  
: the next.

My suggestion involved a control channel that gives your repeater absolute priority and would not work in both directions. His shuts up when yours transmits... period.

: Unfortunately, hams don't have access to the same level of technology  
: in commercially-available radios.

Hams have access to any level of technology to which they choose to have access. I would have a hard time conceiving of a system that the combined efforts of the Intel and Motorola ARC's here in Chandler, AZ couldn't come up with. Do you guys need any help from the Valley of the Sun?

: Being obnoxious. Don't worry, its not a acquired trait, its a talent  
: you're borne with. -- Michael P. Deignan

If it works on a repeater, I wonder why it doesn't work on Internet? :-)

73, KG7BK, 00TC, CecilMoore@delphi.com

-----

Date: 13 Jun 1994 01:09:51 -0700  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Cecil A. Moore -FT-- (cmoore@ilx018.intel.com) wrote:  
: Michael P. Deignan (md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu) wrote:

: : The problem is that \*I\* don't agree to it, since the problem can  
: : work in both directions. Maybe its my repeater one time, and then his  
: : the next.

: My suggestion involved a control channel that gives your repeater absolute  
: priority and would not work in both directions. His shuts up when yours  
: transmits... period.

This would work if the control channel actually controlled the users radio as is done with trunking radios or cellular radio telephones. A control channel requires cooperation between both compeating groups to work. The engineers at Motorola and other telecommunications companies developed trunking and the cellular technology to be able to serve more users in a given number of channels. Ten trunked channels could support 200 user groups in the commercial use. Ten amateur rag chewers could tie up that system for days ;)

: : Unfortunately, hams don't have access to the same level of technology  
: : in commercially-available radios.

It is really market driven...

: Hams have access to any level of technology to which they choose to have  
: access. I would have a hard time conceiving of a system that the combined  
: efforts of the Intel and Motorola ARC's here in Chandler, AZ couldn't come

: up with. Do you guys need any help from the Valley of the Sun?

We need your help ... but remember those ten rag chewers when you design a new technology amateur repeater system serving a hundred talk groups.

: : Being obnoxious. Don't worry, its not a acquired trait, its a talent

You got that right ;)

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

-----  
Date: Mon, 13 Jun 1994 03:32:00 EST  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@ames.arpa  
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>cmoore@ilx01.intel.com (Cecil A. Moore -FT--~) writes:

>  
>> Hi Michael, this slow-thinking Texan is trying to understand. If the  
>> coordinated station transmits, then the uncoordinated station  
>> does not transmit... no PL involved. Both repeater inputs are PLed  
>> on different frequencies. Somebody, I think from Michigan, said they  
>> had run this configuration for years without problems. If the un-  
>> coordinated repeater detects any RF on the output frequency, then it  
>> simply refuses to transmit... why won't that work?

The two repeaters talked about are the 146.76 repeaters in Cleveland (of which I am a trustee and control operator) and the same in Detroit, MI. We use different PL (110.9 Cle and 100.0 (?) in Detroit). There are two repeaters in the next county down from us (147.03 I think) that share the same frequency AND live very close. One has Anit-Buzz (in other words it will NOT key if ANY CTCSS is present) and one is tone only. One is high profile one is not. Seems to work fine for them.

>  
>1. The proposal said that the "open" repeater would not have a PL,  
> while mine would. If a PL was detected, the "open" repeater would

> not transmit, ie. if my PL was present, then my machine would transmit  
> and not theirs. If my PL wasn't present, then their machine would  
> transmit.

Then PL Both differently as yours is running PL, so should the new commer.

> 2. Even assuming that #1 does work okay, the fact remains that unless  
> both machines have exactly the same coverage areas, there will be  
> instances where users on the "open" machine may be having a QSO,  
> and a user on my machine keys up my repeater because s/he cannot  
> hear them, and ZAP! my machine obliterates the QSO on the "open"  
> repeater.

As usual, you INTENTIONALLY or ignorantly ignore the comment that all that is needed is for the OTHER REPEATER SITE to hear YOUR REPEATER. If YOUR repeater is TRANSMITTING! the new repeater will NOT TRANSMIT! Can we say "inhibit"? For a guy with a .edu on the end of his address you miss a lot of plain english! (Intentionally?)

> 3. Let's say that my user can hear the QSO, and he needs to make a call  
> to get in touch with his wife, etc. Is he supposed to remove his  
> PL, put his callsign in on the "open" repeater and ask to make a call,  
> get permission, put the PL back on, wait for the tail of the "open"  
> repeater to drop, make his call on my machine, perhaps have a minute  
> or two of conversation, clear on my machine, wait for the tail to  
> drop, remove the PL again, go back to the open machine, relinquish  
> control back to the parties who were having a QSO? And, oh, let's not  
> forget ID'ing on both machines, perhaps leading to confusion if  
> someone thinks he's finished while he's removing the PL on his  
> radio. And, you're forgetting that my machine, although closed, is  
> heavily accessed.

Lets remember that the intent is to reduce interference, not prohibit communications. As with simplex, one must wait until the frequency is not in use. As for IDing, just have the uncoordinated repeater ID at the end of the squelch tail. No ID problem any more. As to shared use, well, maybe the new repeater should try 900 or 1.2 (or 440 if not filled in the area, as this discussion has moved out of So. Cal. long ago).

>Nope, the only way to really solve the problem is the solution that  
>coordinating bodies have been using - geographical distance multiplexing.

Bzzzzzzzzzzzzzzt! Wrong AGAIN! (You seem to make this an advocacy (or is being wrong a vocation with you?))

>  
>MD

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

-----

Date: 13 Jun 1994 06:32:53 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!caen!crl.dec.com!  
crl.dec.com!nnnpd.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: CW Argument...  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun12.130035.1@woods.uml.edu>, martinja@woods.uml.edu (JJ Martin) writes:

|>CW never stopped anyone from becoming a ham or upgrading!!!  
|>  
|>Only people who refuse to learn the code stop themselves. Until the CW  
|>requirement is amended or deleted any argument about it is moot.

I see, I guess debating changing anything must be moot.

|>Anyone who wants to argue with me about the above...feel free! I'll let you  
|>win everytime! I'll even tell you now, before you start, you're so right.  
|>but then...how come I have an Extra Class ticket...and you don't?  
|>  
|>This message is not intended for anyone holding an Extra Class ticket or a  
|>CSCE for same....I can hear you snickering out there.  
|>  
|>P.S. When and if the CW requirement is ever deleted, what will you want next?  
|>Open book exams?!? Yeah, that would make it easier. Easier is what you want,  
|>right?

Well I'd vote for a personality test so we could screen out obnoxious arrogant little dweebs.

73 and have a nice day,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----

Date: 13 Jun 1994 06:43:43 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!bloom-beacon.mit.edu!  
crl.dec.com!crl.dec.com!nnnpd.lkg.dec.com!iamu.chi.dec.com!little@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Usefulness of the amateur service

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2tcsa0\$3sg@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

|>

|>dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller) writes:

|>

|>> Isn't disaster relief enough reason in itself to allow people to voluntarily

|>> buy their own high dollar radios and provide critical comms in an emergency?

|>

|>No. Nothing is worse than having a police-authority-wannabe show up with

|>his HT thinking he's going to start running the show. Not to mention that

|>he hasn't had any training in emergency communications and the like...

I'm sure the thousands of trained RACES members will appreciate your vote of confidence. Perhaps in your area, you've chased everyone but the police wannabes away?

|>> Why is it that we have to bail out the local civil defense and FEMA idiots

|>> \_every\_ time there's an emergency?

|>

|>You vastly overestimate your worth.

You vastly overstate your knowledge.

73,

Todd

N9MWB

Palatine ESDA/RACES

-----

Date: 13 Jun 94 08:47:00 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!

dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <JyzvXVJ.edellers@delphi.com>, <2tctmo\$4ua@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,

<hi0NnHf.edellers@delphi.com>

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Michael P. Deignan <md@pstc3.pstc.brown.edu> writes:

>

>>Or (C) my machine receives a signal outside of your operating area,

>>but within mine, and my machine proceeds to clobber a QSO ongoing on

>>your machine because I'm running 250 watts into a 13db gain vertical.



>

>Which apparently would be legal, since yours is coordinated and mine would not  
>be. (However, two can play that game.)

Now now, boys. Play nice!

And remember the (new) uncoordinated machine has the PRIMARY responsibility  
for resolving interference, Part 97 does not say "SOLE" or "ONLY", just  
"PRIMARY!!!!"

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price  
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what  
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME  
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

-----  
Date: 13 Jun 94 09:12:00 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!

dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tfk70\$frd@chnews.intel.com>, <2tg3t1\$t5v@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>,  
<2tghf8\$kvj@ccnet.ccnet.com>

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>I really have to laugh as here in the Bay Area the hams ARE the  
>coordinators of cellular telephones. Many of the radio engineers who  
>design the cellular network are amateurs. They are also the trustees of  
>local repeaters. At work they design systems that only cover a couple of  
>square miles and are limited by capture. At play in the amateur community  
>their systems may cover hundreds to thousands of square miles. A totally  
>different scale. At work they have technology to help them sort out the  
>limited spectrum. Smart radios that can automatically frequency hop  
>and change to six different power levels all under three watts.

I have to point out that (although my HT does NOT have this feature) it  
would not be wise for me to use it. One of our repeaters, which I use  
a lot, has 3 remote receive sites. One that I can SEE from my window.  
However the repeater is MILES away. I get medium to low scale readings for  
it. If I used it I would be on HIGH power the whole time while 450  
milliwatts does me just fine. I usually use EXTREME minimum power because  
of my proximity to the auxiliary input. This would not be the case under  
automatic control.

>  
>How many amateurs have this kind of technology in the amateur service? One  
>of the new portable radios has a power scaling function built in. If the  
>radio hears the repeater full scale it automatically lowers power. This is  
>a good thing to save battery and it also helps the co-channel repeater.  
>How? lower signal levels on the repeater input frequency. How many of you  
>have turned off this function .... because you are too noisy into the  
>repeater. We are starting to see more and more technology help us provide  
>a higher grade of repeater service than the commercial service providers.  
>  
>How long does it take the amateur community to find that ctcss does not  
>close a repeater... it enhances the repeater.  
>  
>There are eight repeaters on our frequency all at the same mountain top.  
>The users love it. One repeater with eight ctcss tones encode and decode.  
>All the new hams are using tone 100 and the old grouches use tone 114.8 .  
>Neither group has to listen to each other as they can decode their own  
>group. We ask that when groups are talking that they not decode but  
>listen in the clear. When monitoring they can decode for their group.  
>Some tone groups are not vary active, they are used as intercoms for  
>RACES and ARES groups. Each one of these groups could have its own  
>repeater but through modern technology they can all enjoy the use of one  
>good repeater. No lock-outs no bs political constraints, just a lot of  
>different small groups enjoying amateur radio.

True.

> "Join 'The Club'... Endorsed by repeater owners everywhere..."  
>  
>Bob

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price  
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what  
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME  
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

-----

Date: 13 Jun 94 08:51:00 GMT  
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!  
dan@ucbvax.berkeley.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2tcu0a\$50v@cat.cis.Brown.EDU>, <2te5l9\$g4p@chnews.intel.com> ,

<2tfjlv\$ah8@ccnet.ccnet.com>  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

rwilkins@ccnet.com (Bob Wilkins n6fri) writes:

>Cecil A. Moore -FT-- (cmoore@ilx018.intel.com) wrote:

>

>: Hi Michael, this slow-thinking Texan is trying to understand. If the  
>: coordinated station transmits, then the uncoordinated station  
>: does not transmit... no PL involved. Both repeater inputs are PLed  
>: on different frequencies. Somebody, I think from Michigan, said they  
>: had run this configuration for years without problems. If the un-  
>: coordinated repeater detects any RF on the output frequency, then it  
>: simply refuses to transmit... why won't that work?

>

>The un-coordinated station is unable to detect rf on the output frequency  
>do to its own transmitter in operation.

The detection is made BEFORE the uncoordinated machine transmits.

>Unknowing users of the

>un-coordinated repeater may wish to communicate with the users they hear  
>on the coordinated repeater and find that they are locked out of the  
>conversation. This leads to frustration and later resentment as most  
>repeater users expect to find only one repeater on a frequency.

Not from what has been said in this thread before. And maybe they need to  
LEARN how to share frequencies and be polite and cooperate.

>Here in California you will find many closed 440 repeater groups have two  
>or three different repeaters operating in the same general area on the  
>same frequency. This configuration does work in a closed membership as the  
>members have all agreed that it will work :) A typical example would have  
>a high level repeater covering a large area from 5000 feet elevation with  
>many low level repeaters down in the local towns used as autopatch or  
>local talk repeaters. Because a single cooperative group can operate on  
>one frequency instead of three channels does not mean that three or four  
>compeating open groups could do the same thing.

Hummm, seems to work ok on simplex. In business. And GMRS (I can think of  
3 GMRS repeaters in this county alone on ONE PAIR all separated by CTCSS).

>In essance most closed repeater groups have more restrictions placed on  
>their members than one would find on a normal open repeater. I find this  
>to be quite healthy for amateur radio.

As do \_I\_, sir.

>Bob

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price  
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what  
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME  
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #255

\*\*\*\*\*